REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. The Applicant has amended Claims 1-8, 12-18, 22 and 24-25. Support for these amendments can in be found in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0035]-[0043]. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 1-9, 12-19 and 22-25 remain pending. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed December 14, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant's summary of the interview between Examiner Oanh L. Duong and Applicant's representative, Ari G. Akmal, conducted February 5, 2008 is the same as the Statement of Substance of Interview filed by Applicant on February 6, 2008. Additionally, a subsequent interview was conducted between Examiner Oanh L. Duong, Supervisory Examiner Saleh Najjar and Applicant's representative, Ari G. Akmal, on February 20, 2008. The differences between the claims of the present application and the prior art (Wilf) were discussed. No agreement was reached.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9 and 12-19 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,824 ("Wilf") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0212594 ("Hogan"). Claims 22-25 stand rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,496,824 ("Wilf") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,032,017 ("Chow") and Hogan. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites a method of identifying a visitor at a network site comprising: receiving an address from a visitor server computer and a first characteristic of a requesting visitor computer; requesting information regarding a second characteristic of the requesting visitor computer after receiving the address and the first characteristic, wherein requesting information comprises sending a request for the second characteristic of the requesting visitor computer to the visitor server computer; receiving the information regarding the second characteristic of the requesting visitor computer from the visitor server computer; and generating a first visitor identifier using the address, the first characteristic and the second characteristic. Thus, the application pertains to systems and methods for identification of visitors at a network site. In one embodiment, a visitor may access a network site using a

computer. Characteristics associated with the visitor computer may be determined and an identifier generated for the visitor using the determined characteristics. Claims 12 and 22 recite similar limitations.

Specifically, in one embodiment, a request may be received from a requesting visitor computer (e.g. an HTTP request or the like) at a website computer. One or more characteristics of the visitor computer may be determined at the website computer utilizing the request from the visitor computer. Additionally, the website computer may send a query for additional information regarding characteristics of the visitor computer. This query may, for example, be sent to a visitor server computer to which the visitor computer is coupled or the like. The visitor computer may maintain one or more databases, storage tables, or other mechanisms or applications which associate individual visitor computers coupled to the visitor server computer with information corresponding to those individual visitor computers. Thus, the visitor server computer may respond to the request for additional information regarding characteristics of the requesting visitor computer.

Using characteristics obtained utilizing the request and characteristics obtained via the query, an identifier corresponding to the requesting visitor computer may be generated. Thus, the identifier may, in one embodiment, be determined after the characteristics have been determined from the request received from the requesting visitor computer and after characteristics are obtained via the query to the visitor server computer. This visitor identifier may be used for a variety of ways, including session tracking, etc.

In contrast, Wilf discloses a method for session management where a token is generated by digitally hashing a plurality of identifiers contained in a request. (*See* Wilf, Abstract) As disclosed at many places in Wilf, a request may be received, where the request contains a plurality of identifiers and a digital hash generated from one or more of these identifiers. (*See* Wilf, Abstract, Summary, Col. 4, Lines 5-15, 40-50) More specifically, a text string may be generated by concatenating identifiers obtained from the request and this text string hashed to generate a fingerprint (i.e. token). This fingerprint may be stored along with corresponding user information. (*See* Wilf, Col. 4, Lines 5-35)

When a request is received, Wilf creates one of these fingerprint using identifiers obtained from the request. If that fingerprint exists in a database additional user information may be collected from the request and stored in the database along with the fingerprint. Otherwise the fingerprint is stored in the database along with user information collected from the request. (*See* Wilf, Col. 4, Lines 40-65)

At least two things should be noted here. First, when a server "collects" information in Wilf, the server is determining identifiers from a received request not sending a query to obtain additional information from another computer, such as the computer or server from which the request was received. (*See* Wilf, Col. 4, Lines 45-50)

Second, the fingerprint or identifier for a user is determined solely from identifiers obtained from a request. As described in Wilf, at Col. 4, Lines 40-65 a fingerprint is determined before any additional user data is collected. Thus, any additional user information collected is stored in conjunction with the fingerprint NOT used in generating the fingerprint.

Furthermore, the Hogan reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Wilf reference. Hogan only discloses that:

> In addition, supplemental data items are also obtained based on data in the header. These supplemental data items can be derived directly or indirectly from the header data. For example, the IP address can be used to query a geolocation database to obtain location related data, such as country, time zone, city, etc. Location related data is an example of data directly derived from the header. Data items indirectly derived from the header information are obtained by performing a calculation or other process such as a lookup, based on the header information and/or the location related data, and using the calculated data to obtain the supplemental data items. An example of indirectly derived data is the use of the time zone information to determine the time of day the browser request was received. Other indirectly derived supplemental data items include, day of week, day of month, as well as industry cycles and other events based on the time and date data. All of the data items described above, namely, the visitor supplied data items obtained directly from the header and the supplemental data items derived either directly or indirectly from the header are defined herein as data items relating to a web browser request. (See Hogan Paragraph [0019])

Thus, it seems Hogan only discloses that information in an initially received request (header information) can be used to derive supplemental information by accessing third party service such as a lookup service. Not that additional information can be obtained using the visitor server computer from which the request was initially received. Consequently, neither Wilf nor Hogan queries a visitor server computer from which a request was received regarding additional information about the requesting visitor computer which originally issued the request. Accordingly, neither Wilf nor Hogan discloses the limitations of Claim 1 which recites requesting information regarding a second characteristic of the requesting visitor computer after receiving the address and the first characteristic, wherein requesting information comprises sending a request for the second characteristic of the requesting visitor computer to the visitor server computer; receiving the information regarding the second characteristic of the requesting

visitor computer from the visitor server computer; and generating a first visitor identifier using the address, the first characteristic and the second characteristic.

Accordingly, as Wilf and Hogan do not disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1, similar Claim 12 and their respective pending dependent Claims 2-9 and 13-19.

Additionally, as Claim 22 recites limitations similar to Claims 1 and 12 and Chow does not remedy the deficiencies of Wilf and Hogan, Applicant submits that the arguments presented above with respect to Claim 1 applies equally well here and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 22 and Claims 23-25 which are dependent on Claim 22.

Conclusion

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-9, 12-19 and 22-25. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant

John L. Adair
Reg. No. 48,828

Date: March 14, 2008
1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088